

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 18, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered and entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected.

Claims 5-10 are objected to for being dependent upon a rejected based claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 11-19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

The Specification is objected to failing to contain header information.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the objection to the specification for the same reasons recited in applicant's prior response. Applicant respectfully declines to amend the disclosure to include the suggested headings at this time.

Claims 11-19 stand rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Office Action asserts that it is unclear as to the orientation of the plurality of furs prior to the applying said electrostatic force.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims. However, in the interest of advance the prosecution of this matter, applicant has elected to amend independent claim 11 to recite that the plurality of furs are laying nearly flat on the surface. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 2, lines 19-21 of the instant specification.

For the amendment made to the claims, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In overcoming the rejection of the claims, applicant believes that for the amendments made to independent claim 11, claims 11-19 are in allowable form and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Lefkowitz (USP no. 5, 077, 116).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims. However, in view of the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 11, applicant has elected to amend claim 1 in a manner similar to that made to claim 11. According, applicant submits that claims 1-10 are also in allowable form for the same reasons that claims 11-20 are allowable.

Notwithstanding the amendments made to independent claim 1, applicant submits that Lefkowitz fails to anticipate the invention claims.

Lefkowitz disclose applying an adhesive conductive layer which may be used to electrostatically apply fiber to the cloth. The fibers are drawn to the adhesive conductive layer by the application of the electrostatic force. The fibers are drawn essentially in a vertical manner.

However, the fibers of Lefkowitz are not responsive to an electrostatic force to be forced to a nearly vertical position, as is recited in the claims. Rather, Lefkowitz merely describes a one time application of an electrostatic force to attract the fibers to the adhesive conductive layer.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.

Lefkowitz cannot be said to anticipate the subject matter recited in the claims as Lefkowitz fails to expressly or inherently describe each and every element recited in the independent claims.

With regard to the remaining claims, these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and, thus, the remaining dependent claims are also allowable by

virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, without arguing the merits of each claim individually.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Lefkowitz reference.

With regard to the rejection of claim 2, applicant submits that this claim depends from independent claim 1, and, thus, this claim is also allowable by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim, without arguing the merits of the claim.

With regard to the objection of claims 5-10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form. However, applicant respectfully submits that these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and, thus are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims are in allowable form and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone given below.

No fees are believed necessary for the timely filing of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079

Date: September 15, 2008

/Carl A. Giordano/
By: Carl A. Giordano
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41, 780

Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615